objection to the drawings, enclosed herewith are a new complete set of formal drawings, Figs. 1-7, including an amended Fig. 1 containing reference numeral 31. Also enclosed is a photocopy of Fig. 1 showing newly added reference numeral 31 in red for the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 8-13 and 21-25.

With respect to claim 1, in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Bogart discloses "the lower surface of the sheet confronting the second surface of the substrate and being constructed and located to move with respect to the second surface of the substrate in a direction generally parallel to the substrate (col. 3, lines 40-42, col. 4, lines 30-44, and col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 2)". Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Bogart. The Examiner's attention is drawn to the portions of the specification relied upon by the Examiner, and more specifically to col. 4, lines 30-38, which state, in relevant part "The permanent attachment of the stretchable strip 52 to the film 54 can be effected by lamination, or by extruding the film onto the stretchable strip material. If lamination is employed, the film 54 is coated with a pressure sensitive dry adhesive, the coating being applied at a rate of 1.2-1.7 oz./yd^2. Regardless of whether lamination or extrusion is employed, an external side 58 of the stretchable strip will adhere to an internal side 60 of the film." (Emphasis supplied.) It is clear from the foregoing that Bogart teaches that the stretchable strip 52, which the Examiner indicated corresponds to Applicants' substrate, is permanently attached to the film 54, which the Examiner stated corresponds to Applicants' sheet of material having a low coefficient of friction, over the entire surfaces of sides 58 and 60. Therefore, this section of Bogart, which was relied upon by the Examiner, does not disclose that strip 52 moves with respect to film 54 in a direction generally parallel to the substrate, and there is no such disclosure in any other portion of Bogart. There would also be no inherent anticipation as Bogart teaches using an adhesive which is coated onto film 54 for bonding strip 52 to film 54, or extruding film 54 onto the strip material. If bonded with an adhesive, the film would be fixedly attached to the strip, and could not move with respect to it. If the film 54 is extruded onto the stretchable strip 52, this extrusion process again would tightly bond the film to the strip, thereby preventing any movement between strip 52 and film 54.

Bogart achieves its result not by allowing movement of strip 52 with respect to film 54, but by providing a low-friction film surface in a location so that it faces the clothing "so that

frictional shear forces developed upon rubbing the external face of the dressing against a surface will be lower than would be the case if the stretchable fabric strip 52 defined the external face of the dressing. As a result, the dressing will be less likely to be rubbed off, so the strength of adhesion of the dressing to the skin can be reduced in order to lower the level of discomfort to the patient when the dressing is moved from the skin." (Col. 4, lines 42-49). Therefore, Bogart reduces the frictional shear forces only by reducing friction between the item of clothing and the outer film covering of a bandage, and not, as in the present invention, by also allowing movement of an outer film with respect to a low-friction surface on the substrate.

Accordingly, the limitation of claim 1, which recites "the lower surface of the sheet confronting the second surface of the substrate and being constructed and located to move with respect to the second surface of the substrate in a direction generally parallel to the substrate" is not anticipated by Bogart. This limitation also is not obvious over Bogart, since Bogart directly teaches away from this limitation by indicating that the stretchable strip is either laminated to the film, or is adhesively secure thereto.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites that the second surface of the substrate has a low coefficient of friction. In contrast, Bogart, at col. 4, lines 39-41, teaches that "the material of the film has a lower coefficient of friction than the fabric material of the stretchable fabric strip 52". Therefore, Bogart also does not anticipate or render obvious this limitation, since side 58 of strip 52 has a higher coefficient of friction than side 60 of film 54.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by or obvious over Bogart.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 21 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. More particularly, claim 21 recites "the sheet of low-friction material being movable with respect to the bandage to minimize the transfer of any friction forces from items of clothing to the blister." As discussed above, Bogart fails to disclose this limitation. Moreover, claim 21 is not obvious over Bogart, as Bogart actually teaches away from this limitation by reciting methods of bonding such that the film 54 could not move with respect to strip 52.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 22 and 23 are also allowable for the same reasons as claim 1, since they contain similar limitations. Claim 22 recites "the layer of low-friction material being movable with respect to the low-friction surface on the bandage to minimize transfer of any frictional forces from clothing to the area of skin to be protected." Claim 23

recites "a second layer of a low-friction material being disposed adjacent and attached to the upper surface of the first layer in such a manner that the second layer moves with respect to the upper surface of the first layer in a direction generally parallel to the upper surface of the first layer in response to forces applied to the second layer."

It is respectfully submitted that rejected claims 8-13 are all allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1, since these claims are dependent from claim 1. It is also submitted that claims 24 and 25 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 23, since these claims are dependent from claim 23.

Claim 9 is not obvious over Bogart for an additional reason. There is no suggestion whatsoever in Bogart to space the attachment locations from one another. The extrusion and laminating methods taught by Bogart are not known to be readily adapted to permit spaced attachment locations, and Bogart does not suggest any such attachment.

With respect to claims 10, 11 and 12, the Examiner concedes that Bogart fails to teach that the substrate layer has a coefficient of friction less than 1.0. The Examiner states that "the purpose of the device of Bogart is to allow the film layer and the substrate layer to easily move with one another." Applicants respectfully disagree that this is the purpose of Bogart. Bogart teaches that strip 52 has a much higher coefficient of friction than film 54 and does not suggest lowering the coefficient of friction of strip 52. Rather, Bogart's solution to the higher coefficient of friction for strip 52 is to permanently laminate or extrude strip 52 and film 54 together to prevent movement of these two materials with respect to one another. Any such movement would defeat the purpose of Bogart, which is to reduce the shear forces. If the film 54 were movable with respect to the strip 52, because of the relatively high coefficient of friction of strip 52, the shear forces actually would be increased, rather than decreased. Bogart achieves its goal by presenting a low friction surface on film 54 to clothing. In the absence of any suggestion by Bogart to reduce the coefficient of friction of strip 52, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to select the claimed coefficient of friction of less than 1.0, in the absence of hindsight gained by Applicant's teachings. These arguments are particularly applicable to claims 11 and 12, which recite, respectively, coefficients of friction of about 0.7 or less, and 0.2 to about 0.7.